

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

GEORGE S COLE 495 SEAPORT COURT SUITE 101 REDWOOD CITY CA 94063

## **COPY MAILED**

MAR 0 5 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

David O. McGoveran

Application Number: 09/476711

Filing Date: 12/30/1999

For: DECLARATIVE METHOD FOR

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition filed on January 23, 2008, under 37 CFR 1.137(b), to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned on May 26, 2007, for failure to timely reply to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121) mailed on April 25, 2007, in response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and submission filed on February 19, 2007, which set a one (1) month shortened period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on December 12, 2007.

Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

<sup>(1)</sup> the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continuing examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application abandoned for failure to pay the publication\_fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

<sup>(2)</sup> the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

<sup>(3)</sup> a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may required additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

<sup>(4)</sup> any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

Receipt of the corrections to the amendment as required by the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed on April 25, 2007, filed with the present petition is acknowledged.

The statement contained in the instant petition does not set forth that the entire delay from the due date of the required reply to the date of the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional as required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). However, the statement contained in the instant petition is being so construed. Petitioner **must** notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply. The five (5)-month extension request filed on January 23, 2008, was submitted more than five (5) months after the end of the period for reply to the Notice mailed on April 25, 2007, and therefore is unnecessary. The extension of time fee paid on January 23, 2008, will be credited to counsel's deposit account as authorized.

The application is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 3623 for further processing.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571)272-3231.

Douglas I. Wood

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions

See In re Application of S., 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988).